



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/974,946	10/09/2001	Michael M. Hsu	12868-007001	7562
26181	7590	04/13/2004	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. 3300 DAIN RAUSCHER PLAZA MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			SHERR, CRISTINA O	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	

DATE MAILED: 04/13/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/974,946

Applicant(s)

HSU ET AL.

Examiner

Cristina O Sherr

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 October 2001.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the application filed 9 October 2001.

Claims 1-34 have been examined in this case.

Specification

2. The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurtado et al (US 6,418,421B1) in view of Stefik et al (US 6,714,921B2).

5. Regarding claim 1 –

Hurtado discloses a method for transferring one or more media files from a content server to a media playback device, comprising: receiving a request of one or more media files to be transferred to a particular media playback device, the one or more media files having associated expiration rules; obtaining information about the particular media playback device; determining, based on the information about the particular media playback device, whether the particular media playback device has the capability to enforce the expiration rules associated with the one or more media files; if the media

Art.Unit: 3621

playback device has the capability to enforce the expiration rules, formatting the requested one or more media files such that they can only be rendered by the particular playback device and transferring the formatted files and the expiration rules to the particular media playback device (col 6 ln 3-36).

6. Regarding claim 2 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the media files further have associated content rights and further comprising: determining, based on the information about the particular media playback device, whether the particular media playback device satisfies the content rights associated with the one or more media files; and if the particular media playback device does not satisfy the content rights, denying transfer of the one or more media files to the particular playback device (col 9 ln 53 – col 10 ln 28).

7. Regarding claim 3 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the media files further have associated content rights and further comprising: obtaining information about a user account associated with the particular media playback device, the user account having associated usage rights; determining, based on the information about the user account, whether the usage rights satisfy the content rights associated with the one or more media files; and if the usage rights do not satisfy the content rights, denying transfer of the one or more media files to the particular playback device (col 10 ln 29-45).

8. Regarding claim 4 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the information about the particular media playback device includes a unique device identifier and device capabilities for playing media files (col 10 ln 29-45).

9. Regarding claim 5 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 1, further comprising: generating a current time stamp; and transferring the current time stamp to a secure location on the media playback device (col 13 ln 5-10).

10. Regarding claim 6 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 1, wherein the expiration rules include a maximum number of playbacks for the one or more media files (col 15 ln 16-24).

11. Regarding claim 7 –

Stefik discloses a method wherein the expiration rules include a relative expiration time for the one or more media files (col 3 ln 56 – col 4 ln 32).

12. Regarding claim 8 –

Stefik discloses a method wherein the expiration rules include an absolute expiration time for the one or more media files (col 4 ln 1-9).

13. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hurtado and Stefik in order to obtain a more economical and user-friendly form of security for digital data.

14. Claims 9-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurtado et al (US 6,418,421B1) in view of Stefik et al (US 6,714,921B2).

15. Regarding claim 9 –

Art Unit: 3621

Hurtado discloses a method for updating expiration rules for media files to be played on a media playback device, comprising: receiving a request for updating expiration rules for one or more media files; obtaining information about a particular media playback device; obtaining current expiration rules for the one or more media files for which an update has been requested; comparing the current expiration rules with expiration rules stored on the content server for the one or more media files to determine if the current expiration rules can be updated; if the current expiration rules can be updated, transferring new expiration rules from a content server to the particular media playback device; if the current expiration rules cannot be updated, requesting a user of the particular media playback device to perform an action before the current expiration rules can be updated; and if the user performs the requested action, transferring new expiration rules from the content server to the particular media playback device (col 6 ln 3-36).

16. Regarding claim 10 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the information about the particular media playback device includes a unique device identifier and device capabilities for playing media files (col 9 ln 53 – col 10 ln 28).

17. Regarding claim 11 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 9, wherein transferring new expiration rules from the content server comprises: transferring the new expiration to a communication module that is operable to communicate with the playback device; and transferring the

Art Unit: 3621

new expiration rules from the communication module to the playback device (col 10 In 29-45).

18. Regarding claim 12 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the current expiration rules include a maximum number of playbacks for the one or more media files (col 15 In 16-24).

19. Regarding claim 13 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 9, wherein the current expiration rules include a relative expiration time for the one or more media files (col 15 In 16-24).

20. Regarding claim 14 –

Stefik discloses a method wherein the current expiration rules include an absolute expiration time for the one or more media files (col 3 In 56 – col 4 In 32).

21. Regarding claim 15 –

Stefik discloses a method wherein updating the current expiration rules comprises: generating a current time stamp; and transferring the current time stamp to a secure location on the media playback device (col 4 In 1-9).

22. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hurtado and Stefik in order to obtain a more economical and user-friendly form of security for digital data.

23. Claims 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurtado et al (US 6,418,421B1) in view of Stefik et al (US 6,714,921B2).

24. Regarding claim 16 –

Hurtado discloses a method for playing a media file on a playback device, comprising:

receiving a user request to play the media file, the media file having one or more associated expiration rules; reading the one or more expiration rules associated with the requested media file; determining, based on the one or more expiration rules, if the media file has expired; if the media file has expired, refusing to play the media file until one or more new expiration rules have been obtained; and if the media file has not expired, playing the media file to the user (col 6 ln 3-36).

25. Regarding claim 17 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 16, further comprising validating a storage medium on the particular playback device (col 9 ln 53 – col 10 ln 28).

26. Regarding claim 18 –

Hurtado discloses the method of claim 16, wherein determining comprises: determining if a maximum number of playbacks for the media file has been reached (col 10 ln 29-45).

27. Regarding claim 19 –

Stefik discloses a method wherein determining comprises: determining if a relative expiration time for the one or more media files has passed (col 3 ln 56 – col 4 ln 32).

28. Regarding claim 20 –

Stefik discloses a method wherein determining comprises: determining if an absolute expiration time for the one or more media files has passed (col 4 ln 1-9).

29. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hurtado and Stefik in order to obtain a more economical and user-friendly form of security for digital data.

Art Unit: 3621

30. Claims 21-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurtado et al (US 6,418,421B1) in view of Stefik et al (US 6,714,921B2).

31. Regarding claim 21 –

Hurtado discloses a content server for transferring media files to a playback device, comprising: means for receiving a request of one or more media files to be transferred to a particular media playback device, the one or more media files having associated expiration rules; means for obtaining information about the particular media playback device; means for determining, based on the information about the particular media playback device, whether the particular media playback device has the capability to enforce the expiration rules associated with the one or more media files; means for formatting the requested one or more media files such that they can only be rendered by the particular playback device and transferring the formatted files and the expiration rules to the particular media playback device, if the media playback device has the capability to enforce the expiration rules (col 6 ln 3-36).

32. Regarding claim 22 –

Hurtado discloses the content server of claim 21 wherein the media files further have associated content rights and further comprising: means for determining, based on the information about the particular media playback device, whether the particular media playback device satisfies the content rights associated with the one or more media files; and means for denying transfer of the one or more media files to the particular playback device if the particular media playback device does not satisfy the content rights (col 9 ln 53 – col 10 ln 28).

33. Regarding claim 23 –

Hurtado discloses the content server of claim 21, wherein the media files further have associated content rights and further comprising: means for obtaining information about a user account associated with the particular media playback device, the user account having associated usage rights; means for determining, based on the information about the user account, whether the 10 usage rights satisfy the content rights associated with the one or more media files; and means for denying transfer of the one or more media files to the particular playback device if the usage rights do not satisfy the content rights (col 10 ln 29-45).

34. Regarding claim 24 –

Hurtado discloses the content server of claim 21, wherein the information about the particular media playback device includes a unique device identifier and device capabilities for playing media files (col 10 ln 29-45).

35. Regarding claim 25 –

Hurtado discloses the content server of claim 21, further comprising: generating a current time stamp; and transferring the current time stamp to a secure location on the media playback device (col 13 ln 5-10).

36. Regarding claim 26 –

Stefik discloses a content server wherein the expiration rules include a maximum number of playbacks for the one or more media files (col 3 ln 56 – col 4 ln 32).

37. Regarding claim 27 –

Stefik discloses a content server wherein the expiration rules include a relative expiration time for the one or more media files (col 4 ln 1-9).

38. Regarding claim 28 –

Stefik discloses the content server of claim 21, wherein the expiration rules include an absolute expiration time for the one or more media files (col 4 ln 1-9).

39. Regarding claim 29 –

Stefik discloses a content server further comprising: means for receiving a request for updating expiration rules for one or more media files; means for obtaining information about a particular media playback device; means for obtaining current expiration rules for the one or more media files for which an update has been requested; means for comparing the current expiration rules with expiration rules stored on the content server for the one or more media files to determine if the current expiration rules can be updated; means for transferring new expiration rules from a content server to the particular media 10 playback device if the current expiration rules can be updated; means for requesting a user of the particular media playback device to perform an action before the current expiration rules can be updated if the current expiration rules cannot be updated; and means for transferring new expiration rules from the content server to the particular media playback device if the user performs the requested action (col 3 ln 56 – col 4 ln 32).

40. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hurtado and Stefik in order to obtain a more economical and user-friendly form of security for digital data.

Art Unit: 3621

41. Claims 30-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hurtado et al (US 6,418,421B1) in view of Stefik et al (US 6,714,921B2).

42. Regarding claim 30 –

Hurtado discloses a playback device for playing media files, comprising: means for receiving a user request to play the media file, the media file having one or more associated expiration rules; means for reading the one or more expiration rules associated with the requested media file; means for determining, based on the one or more expiration rules, if the media file has expired; means for refusing playback of the media file until one or more new expiration rules have been obtained if the media file has expired; and means for playing the media file to the user if the media file has not expired (col 6 ln 3-36).

43. Regarding claim 31 –

Hurtado discloses the playback device of claim 30, further comprising means for validating a storage medium on the particular playback device (col 6 ln 3-36).

44. Regarding claim 32 –

Hurtado discloses the playback device of claim 30, wherein the means for determining comprises: means for determining if a maximum number of playbacks for the media file has been reached (col 10 ln 29-45).

45. Regarding claim 33 –

Stefik discloses the playback device of claim 30, wherein the means for determining comprises: means for determining if a relative expiration time for the one or more media files has passed (col 10 ln 29-45).

46. Regarding claim 34 –

Stefik discloses the playback device of claim 30, wherein the means for determining comprises: means for determining if an absolute expiration time for the one or more media files has passed (col 3 ln 56 – col 4 ln 32).

47. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Hurtado and Stefik in order to obtain a more economical and user-friendly form of security for digital data.

48. Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may be applied as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion

49. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

50. Rabin et al (US 6,697,948B1) discloses methods and apparatus for protecting information.

Art Unit: 3621

51. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cristina O Sherr whose telephone number is 703-305-0625. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 8:30 to 5:00.

52. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

53. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600